

REMARKS

1. Interview Summary

On May 9, 2006, an interview was conducted between the Examiner's supervisor, Mr. Thomas Black, and Timothy Le Duc. Mr. Black interpreted the language on pages 2-3 of the Office Action dated March 7, 2006 (in paragraph number 4) as not requiring the Applicant to submit a certified English translation of the priority document. Accordingly, Applicant presently does not intend to submit a certified English translation.

2. Specification

In the Office Action, minor informalities in the specification were objected to. As requested, Applicant has changed preset to present and F1 to F2 in paragraph 0089. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the objections to the specification have been overcome.

3. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

A. Indefiniteness

The Office Action, on page 4, rejected claim 15 as being "indefinite because the condition to be satisfied or not satisfied is not defined or particularly pointed out." Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 15 as amended recites "the condition is satisfied when the intermediary terminal itself is in the particular area or when the communication data is received from another intermediary terminal in the particular area." Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the indefiniteness rejection has been overcome.

B. Incomplete

The Office Action rejected claim 15 as being incomplete and omitting essential structural cooperative relationships. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 15 has been amended to recite “a communication processor operable to receive the communication data from the first receiving segment” and “a first sending segment interconnected with the communication processor.” *See, e.g.*, Para 0054 of Present Application. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the incomplete rejection has been overcome. Claims 16-20 depend upon claim 15, and should be allowable for similar reasons.

4. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the Office Action, claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mosheni (U.S. Patent No. 5,910,179) in view of Masood et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,580,981). Claims 2-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mosheni in view of Masood et al. and further in view of Logsdon et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,890,054). Claims 11-14, 21 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mosheni in view of Masood et al., and in view of Logsdon et al., and further in view of McCrady et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2001/0053699). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

The present invention reduces the amount of broadcast traffic. Initially, communication data is relayed in only a particular direction toward a target area. Once the communication data reaches the target area, then a vehicle in the target area may transmit the communication data in all directions for a limited distance. Therefore, the overall broadcast traffic may be reduced. Applicant currently fails to understand how the portions of the references cited by the Office Action disclose reducing the overall broadcast traffic in a similar manner.

A. Claims 1-14

The Office Action rejected independent claim 1 by relying upon Mosheni in combination with Masood et al. Claim 1 as amended recites “repeating relaying the communication data between two of the terminals such that the communication data is relayed only in a first

particular direction from a first terminal to a second terminal.” The Office Action cites Figure 4 and Col. 6, ll. 36-41 of Masood et al. as disclosing this limitation. However, Col. 6, ll. 36-41 of Masood et al. states that “[i]n step 6 the first host computer determines the number of identical prepared messages which must be sent to reasonably insure one reaches the final destination and thereafter, sends one prepared message to each passing vehicle containing like host computers until this value is reached.” Hence, Masood et al. suggests that a host computer may repeatedly transmit a message. However, Masood et al. does not disclose repeatedly relaying communication data via a number of terminals only in one direction.

The Office Action, on page 6, acknowledges that Mohseni also does not disclose this limitation. Thus, Mohseni cannot cure this deficiency. Therefore, even if one were to combine Masood et al. with Mohseni, this limitation would remain absent.

Claim 1 also recites that the communication data is relayed only in a first particular direction until reaching a particular area and then “relaying the communication data in any direction, after the communication data reaches the intermediary terminal in the particular area.” The Office Action cites Col. 6, ll. 44-50 of Masood et al. as disclosing this limitation. However, Col. 6, ll. 44-50 of Masood et al. states that “[a]s the second host computer is directed to send the stored message upon detection of infrastructure coverage, the second host computer directs the search for the presence of wireless infrastructure coverage in step 8. If infrastructure coverage is not detected, the second host computer directs the continued search for coverage in step 9.” Hence, the portions of Masood et al. cited by the Office Action only suggest that a second host computer may transmit a stored message after detecting infrastructure coverage. However, the portions of Masood et al. cited do not disclose relaying communication data in only one direction

until the communication data reaches a particular area, and only then subsequently relaying the communication data in all directions.

Furthermore, the portion of the abstract of Mohseni cited by the Office Action does not cure this deficiency. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of claim 1 has been overcome. Claims 2-14 depend upon claim 1 and should be allowable for at least similar reasons.

B. Claims 21-22

The Office Action rejected independent claim 21 by relying upon Mosheni and Masood et al. in combination with Logsdon et al. Claim 21 as amended recites “repeatedly relaying the response message between two of the terminals such that the response message is relayed only in a particular direction from a first terminal to a second terminal.” As noted above with respect to claim 1, Figure 4 and Col. 6, ll. 36-41 of Masood et al. relied upon by the Office Action as disclosing this limitation does not disclose repeatedly relaying communication data via a number of terminals only in one direction. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 21 is allowable. Claim 22 depends upon claim 21 and should be allowable for similar reasons.

SUMMARY

Applicant respectfully submits that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance and seeks allowance thereof. If for any reason the Examiner is unable to allow the application but believes that an interview would be helpful to resolve any issues, he is respectfully requested to call the undersigned at (312) 321-4277.

Respectfully submitted,



Timothy J. Le Duc
Registration No. 54,745
Attorney for Applicant

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610
(312) 321-4200

Dated: May 23, 2006